



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

2/c

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/049,377	06/25/2002	Christian Gancet	ATOCM 249	3635
23599	7590	01/21/2004		
MILLEN, WHITE, ZELANO & BRANIGAN, P.C. 2200 CLARENDON BLVD. SUITE 1400 ARLINGTON, VA 22201			EXAMINER MRUK, BRIAN P	
			ART UNIT 1751	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 01/21/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/049,377	GANCET ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Brian P Mruk	1751	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 September 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 9-5-2002
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Information Disclosure Statement

1. The listing of references in the specification is not a proper information disclosure statement. 37 CFR 1.98(b) requires a list of all patents, publications, or other information submitted for consideration by the Office, and MPEP § 609 A(1) states, "the list may not be incorporated into the specification but must be submitted in a separate paper." Therefore, unless the references have been cited by the examiner on form PTO-892, they have not been considered.

Specification

2. This application does not contain an abstract of the disclosure as required by 37 CFR 1.72(b). An abstract on a separate sheet is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

5. Instant claim 1 recites the limitation "easily degradable". The term "easily degradable" renders the claim vague and indefinite, since one of ordinary skill in the art would not be able to ascertain the metes and bounds of the term "easily degradable". Furthermore, the specification does not contain guidelines describing what numerical values are encompassed by the phrase "easily degradable". Appropriate correction and/or clarification is required.

6. Instant claim 1 contains the variable "n", but does not define the variable "n". This renders the claim vague and indefinite, since it is unclear what values are represented by the variable "n". Appropriate correction and/or clarification is required.

7. Claims 3 and 4 recite the limitation "in that the polyacrylic chains" in lines 1-2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. Specifically, the examiner notes that instant claim 1, from which claims 3 and 4 depend from, does not recite the limitation "polyacrylic chains". The examiner suggests that instant claims 3 and 4 should be amended to recite "polycarboxylic chains" to provide proper antecedent basis. Appropriate correction and/or clarification is required.

8. Claims 4 and 6 contain the phrase "such as". The phrase "such as" renders the claim vague and indefinite, since it is unclear if the claim limitations that appear after the phrase "such as" are required. The examiner suggests that the phrase "such as" and the limitations that follow "such as" should be removed from claims 4 and 6, or that

claims 4 and 6 should be amended to list the limitations following "such as" in Markush Form. Appropriate correction and/or clarification is required.

9. Instant claims 7-9 recite the limitation "constructed on". This limitation renders the claim vague and indefinite, since it is unclear what applicant is attempting to claim with the phrase "constructed on". It appears to the examiner that applicant is attempting to further limit the material used as the biodegradable core (A) in instant claims 7-9, but it is unclear with applicant's current claim language. Appropriate correction and/or clarification is required.

10. Claim 10 provides for the use of a hydrophilic polymer, but, since the claim does not set forth any steps involved in the method/process, it is unclear what method/process applicant is intending to encompass. A claim is indefinite where it merely recites a use without any active, positive steps delimiting how this use is actually practiced.

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed recitation of a use, without setting forth any steps involved in the process, results in an improper definition of a process, i.e., results in a claim which is not a proper process claim under 35 U.S.C. 101. See for example *Ex parte Dunki*, 153 USPQ 678 (Bd.App. 1967) and *Clinical Products, Ltd. v. Brenner*, 255 F. Supp. 131, 149 USPQ 475 (D.D.C. 1966).

11. Claims 2-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, for being dependent upon a claim with the above addressed 112 problem.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

12. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

13. Claims 1-6 and 10-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Swift, "Water-Soluble Polymers".

Swift, "Water-Soluble Polymers", discloses water soluble polymers for use in detergent formulations (see page 215, introduction), comprising 74.8-97.1% by weight of an acrylic acid monomer, 10.5-31.6% by weight of a maleic acid monomer, 2.1-5.3% by weight of a crosslinker monomer, such as ethylene glycol dimaleate, and 5-10% by weight of a chain transfer agent (see page 220, Table 5), per the requirements of the instant invention. Therefore, instant claims 1-6 and 10-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Swift, "Water-Soluble Polymers".

Art Unit: 1751

14. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

15. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brian Mruk whose telephone number is (571) 272-1321. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 7:00 AM to 5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Yogendra Gupta, can be reached on (571) 272-1316. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

BIM

Brian Mruk
January 13, 2004

Brian P. Mruk

Brian P. Mruk
Patent Examiner
Tech Center 1700